



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

theology. Let it be ever remembered that she has an apparatus at hand at once and effectually to get rid of those objectionable appendages to her teaching, should such a course be thought desirable. With the "Congregation of the Index" and the "Index Prohibitorius" at her command, the Church of Rome must be held accountable for the entire mass of such theology as that of Dens and Liguori, if not also for a large part of the deluge of villainess and untruth which is daily contaminating society through the popular press. Our dilemma respecting all such publications is this, If they be good and profitable, why disown or cast doubt on their connection with the Church of Rome? If they be evil or absurd, why are they not at once placed in the Index?

We felt, therefore, while culling the curious theological flower from the garden of Dens, on the connection between the use of tobacco and the validity of one of the sacraments of the Church, that we were doing nothing but what was defensible and fair. But there is another class of documents which affords specimens of theology quite as extraordinary as any which could possibly be extracted from the writings of individual teachers in the Church of Rome, and with this difference, that their intimate connection with, or relation to, that Church is even still more immediate and indisputable. We allude to such compositions as the *Missale*, the *Breviarium*, the *Rituale*, and the *Pontificale Romanum*, to mention no others. These volumes stand related to the Church of Rome as the Book of Common Prayer to the United Church of England and Ireland; and as they exhibit the authoritative doctrine and practice of the Papacy in such plain and unmistakable colours, and, besides, may not be so easy of access to certain of our readers as ourselves, we design, from time to time, to give some selections from them, which will, unless we greatly err, strikingly illustrate the curiosities which are to be found in that system.

We shall commence with the *Roman Ritual*. The copy before us is of date 1850, from the press at Mechlin, and with the imprimatur of "Engelbertus," Cardinal Archbishop of that city. It is only necessary to add, as regards the authoritative nature of the volume in question, that (as our learned readers will already know) it was first edited by Pope Pius V., enlarged and revised by Benedict XIV., and has received the successive sanction of every Pontiff from the last-named Pope to the reigning one. Our present extract from the Ritual will contain some notice of the form therein prescribed for the Sacrament of Baptism.

In the prefatory observations, or rubrics, which accompany the prescribed form of Baptism certain matters are stated which come under the head of curious. Thus, whereas we are told that the matter, form, and minister of this sacrament are of divine institution, and absolutely necessary (de jure divino et absolute necessaria), other additions to it, here laid down, are of "apostolic and most ancient tradition." This being premised and borne in mind, our readers will be pleased, as we proceed, to tax their recollections with the *when* and the *how* the ceremonies which we shall notice were apostolically ordained.

Under the heading, "*De ministro Baptismi*,"—the proper minister—we are told that, although the parish priest, or his deputy, is the fittest person to administer the ordinance, yet, in a case of urgency, as of life or death, either of an infant or adult, it may lawfully be administered by any person and in any language (Latin or vernacular), "*cleric or layman, an excommunicated person, believer or unbeliever, Catholic or heretic, man or woman*," provided only that the form and intention be preserved. Hence, we are told that it is the duty of the parish priest to give proper instructions to all the faithful as to the mode of baptizing, and especially nurse tenders, or accoucheurs (*obstetrices*).

The gross indecency which follows this clause may be found in the foot note, locked up in the dead language of the original. We shall not pollute our pages by transcribing it in an English version.

Now, the design of Rome in this accommodating permission may not be, at first sight, apparent; but it is evident to any reflecting mind that her net is thus broadly and freely cast by many and by every hand, male and female, faithful and heretic alike, for the purpose of enclosing the greater multitude. She claims jurisdiction, be it remembered, over all the baptized. Hence the inexpediency, to say the least, of admitting Romish emissaries to the beds of the sick and dying, or to the care of infants. These are some of the means whereby the dominion of that Church is spread, "*per fas et nefas*."

Before, however, the priest can perform this rite properly he must have his implements; the workman must have his tools; and we are accordingly furnished with a list of these, which we shall transcribe in order, as an ecclesiastical curiosity:—(Page 13, &c.)

1. Vessels of holy oil.
2. A vessel with blessed salt.
3. A vessel or silver spoon (or else one made of some other shining metal), for pouring the water on the head

* *De Baptizandis parulis*.—"Nemo in utero matris clausus baptizari debet. Sed si infans caput emerit, et periculum mortis imminet, baptizetur in capite . . . at al aliud membrum emerit, quod vitalem indicet motum, in illo, si periculum impendat, baptizetur," &c.—Page 10.

of the baptized. This vessel or spoon must never be used for any other purpose.

4. A basin for receiving the water which flows off the head of the baptized.

5. A piece of cotton, or silk, or something of the sort, for wiping the parts anointed.

6. Two stoles, one violet coloured, the other white.

7. Bread pith, for wiping the priest's fingers when he washes his hands.

8. A basin for the above purpose.

9. A white garment, like a little cloak, or a little white hood, to be put on the infant's head.

10. A wax candle or taper, to be handed, lighted, to the baptized.

11. The book of forms, viz., the Ritual.

12. The registry for the baptism.

Here is an inventory of, at least, a dozen articles, some of them strange enough in all conscience; but what is noticeable and really curious is, that in the midst of all this particularity the Church of Rome has actually forgotten to make direct mention of the element of water itself. It is alluded to when the basin is mentioned, and in the prescribed form its presence is supposed; but it is passing strange that while salt, and oil, and basins, and stoles, and even saliva itself (p. 20), are all specified, water, which is alone essential, is omitted!

We pass to a consideration of the mode of using this strange farrago of utensils with a single observation. Can it be for a moment believed that all this is really derived from *Apostolical tradition*? Will it be seriously asserted that the immediate followers of our Lord carried about with them such instruments and appliances as these? What trace of such a state of things have we in the New Testament? Had St. Paul silver spoons, jugs, basins, holy oil, holy salt, or bread pith when he baptized the jailer and his household at Philippi? Yet the Church of Rome would have us believe that all this baptismal paraphernalia is not only useful and edifying, but apostolical!

Such are some of the curiosities of the preparation. In our next we shall probably consider the mode of administering the ordinance itself.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All letters meant for publication should be addressed to the Editor, 9, Upper Sackville-street, and the real name and address given, not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of good faith.

We earnestly request our correspondents, both Protestants and Roman Catholics, to limit the length of their communications, when possible, and not in any case to discuss a variety of distinct topics in one letter.

To diminish the chance of disappointment, all letters should be forwarded to the office by the first day of the month.

Contributors of £1 per annum will be furnished with six copies, any of which will be forwarded, as directed, to nominees of the subscriber.

THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN is registered for transmission beyond the United Kingdom.

The Catholic Layman.

DUBLIN, JULY 15, 1858.

THE *Tablet* of June 19 contains an "Encyclical" letter of our holy Father Pope Pius IX. to all the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other ordinaries of the places in communication with the Apostolic See." This letter is dated the 3rd of May, 1858.

Such a letter is always deserving of attention. If we learn nothing else from it, we learn the practical teaching of the Church of Rome, from the highest speaking authority.

We are aware that a large number of learned Roman Catholics, at least in times past, have denied that such a letter from the Pope to all the Bishops of his communion is infallible. Their doctrine is, that the Pope is not infallible without a General Council. Probably the Roman Catholics who now hold this opinion are fewer than they were a hundred years ago. All who hold that the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary has been infallibly decided, must needs hold that the Pope is infallible without a General Council.

If any of our readers think that this letter of the Pope is not infallible, we think them right; but we ask them to consider further how ridiculous it is to speak of a Church having the advantage of infallible direction in matters of faith, or how such supposed direction can secure unity of

faith, when such letters are accepted by one party in the Church of Rome as infallible, and rejected by another party as fallible. Truly, we think Roman Catholics ought to settle this among themselves, before they say any more of differences of opinion among Protestants.

But, at least, we may say that such letters are the highest available authority that the Roman Catholic world now has, or has had since the Council of Trent (300 years ago), for determining what her doctrine and teaching really is; and it is to be observed that this "Encyclical letter" is not from the Pope alone, but is issued by him with the advice and assistance of "our Venerable Brothers, the Cardinals of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, who compose the congregation charged with causing to be respected, and with interpreting, the decrees of the Council of Trent." This is no private letter of the Pope; it is the Pope speaking *ex cathedra*, with the assistance of the advisers constituted for him by the Church of Rome.

The "Encyclical letter" begins with the death of Christ for our salvation, and His ascension into heaven, and His purpose "to dwell, meanwhile, with us in the august sacrament of His body and of His blood." The letter goes on then to "the Priesthood;"—"Declaring Himself the Eternal Priest according to the order of Melchizedec, He has instituted in perpetuity his Priesthood in the Catholic Church . . ."

We have here, under the authority of the Pope and the Congregation of Cardinals, the great artifice and deceit of the Church of Rome about the priesthood. "*Hiereus*" is the Greek word for a priest who sacrifices; under the gospel dispensation that word is applied to Christ,^b and to Christ only. Christ and His Apostles have by their example and authority forbidden us to apply that word to the minister, of Christ, except in that figurative sense in which it may be applied to all Christians.^c The Holy Scriptures never call Christ's minister "*Hiereus*." The Apostles adopted for the ministers of Christ whom they ordained a totally different title, in use among the Jews—"Presbyteros," which title did not imply the power of offering sacrifice. Thus the Apostles pointed out to the Church that Christ's ministers are not to be called "Priest" in the sense in which Christ is called priest—that their priesthood is not of the same kind as His—and that the difference consists, and is expressed, in the great truth, that He offered sacrifice, and they do not. The Pope confounds this great distinction, made by the Apostles, and is careful to call Christ and His ministers "Priests," by the same title, and in the same sense of offering sacrifice.

The English language does not afford two words which forcibly express the difference between "*Hiereus*" and "*Presbyteros*." The Church of England and Ireland calls Christ's ministers "Priests," because "Priest" or "Pres" is really the Saxon contraction of "*Presbyter*." The Church of England and Ireland also calls Christ a "Priest," because the English language has no higher English word for "*Hiereus*;" but the Church of England and Ireland makes it plain to all that Christ only offered sacrifice, and that His ministers do not; thus plainly showing forth, as far as the English language admits, the forcible contrast marked by the inspired writers between Christ and His Apostles in this respect.

Pope Pius IX. wrote his letter, not in English, but in Latin. The Latin language does afford two different terms expressive of "*Hiereus*" and "*Presbyteros*;" but the Pope would not use different words, but applies the same word to the priesthood of Christ and His ministers, for the purpose of making men think that the priesthood of Christ and His ministers is the same in its

^a "Encyclical" means a circular letter; that is, a letter of which many copies are sent to numbers of persons.

^b Heb. v. 6; vii., 15, 17, 21, 24.

^c 1 Peter ii. 5, 9. Rev. i. 6.

nature, in the very sense of both offering the same sacrifice.

This, we say, is the great artifice and deceit of the Church of Rome, about the nature of the priesthood of the ministers of Christ.

The Pope fully applies this unworthy artifice in the following passage, in which we have an excellent opportunity of showing in what we agree with the Pope, and in what we differ from him.

After the passages we quoted above, the Pope goes on to say of Christ:—He has

"Decreed that the sacrifice which He offered once by the effusion of His precious blood on the altar of the cross, to redeem the entire human race, to deliver it from the yoke of sin and from the slavery of the devil, and to pacify all things in the heavens and on the earth, shall be permanent unto the consummation of ages."

To the great truths here expressed we give our most earnest assent.^a Why cannot the Pope confine himself to the great truths of the Christian religion? Those truths alone can establish the unity of the Church on earth. It is when he goes beyond those, and asserts something else as the terms of communion, that he becomes the great disturber of the peace and unity of the Church.

But the Pope then goes on in the same sentence:—

"Ordaining that this sacrifice, in which there is no change except in the manner of offering it,* shall be made and offered each day by the ministry of the priests."

Now, we know that Christ appointed a perpetual commemoration of this sacrifice when He said, "Do this in remembrance of me;" but that Christ ordained that His ministers should offer the same sacrifice that Christ Himself offered we will not believe, until the Pope shows us some authority for it; because this assertion of the Pope is not only without authority in the Word of God, but is contradicted by the inspired writers, when they carefully confined the word "Hierous," which implies the offering of sacrifice, to Christ alone, and carefully applied to His ministers a word that does not imply offering sacrifice.

We cannot follow the Pope in all that he attributes to the offering of this sacrifice by priests on earth. We must come to the great object for which the Pope and the Cardinals wrote this Encyclical letter about the sacrifice of Christ, to "all Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, Bishops," &c.

Was it a deep feeling of the unspeakable importance and interest of the great sacrifice itself that makes him write about it to all bishops of his communion?

No, it was not.

A little question had arisen concerning the times of offering that sacrifice—a question which, to some, may seem very small, but which, to him, seems great—and great, indeed, it is, in the light which it throws upon the religion of which he is the head.

The object of the Pope in writing this Encyclical letter about the sacrifice of Christ is as follows:—Our Roman Catholic readers know that there are in their Church "holy days of obligation," on which days every one is bound to abstain from servile works, and to hear mass. Formerly those days were much more numerous than they now are, and the evil to working people became so much felt that, as Pope Pius IX. states in this letter, various Popes have reduced the number of those days by granting

the people leave to do servile work, and to stay away from mass, on those days. Now, Pope Pius IX. says that he has been informed that—

"Since these indulgences, emanating from the Holy See, were published, the parish priests of different countries believe themselves also relieved from the obligation of offering the holy sacrifice for their parishioners on the days of the suppressed feasts, and have ceased completely to fulfil this duty. Thence there has been established in those countries, among the parish priests, the practice of not celebrating at all, on the above-named days, the holy sacrifice of the mass for the people, and this custom has not wanted apologists and defenders."

This, then, is what the Pope writes about: formerly the people were obliged to hear mass on certain days; and, of course, the priest was obliged to say mass on those days. Now the people are told by authority that they need not come to hear mass on those days; and the priests "of different countries" not unnaturally concluded that since the people were not to come, the mass need not be said.

Of this the Pope writes—

"Full of an extreme solicitude for the entire spiritual flock which the Lord Himself has confided to us, and lively afflicted at the loss of the great spiritual advantages which result from this omission to the faithful of those countries, we have resolved to regulate a matter of such great importance. . . . We have judged it right, venerable brethren, to write you this encyclical letter, in order to trace out for your guidance a sure rule, and to fix for you a law which must be observed with care and vigilance by all parish priests."

And, accordingly, he goes on to decree, that the mass must, in all cases, be said on those days on which the people are not required or expected to come to the mass; and then he graciously gives absolution to all the priests who, in times past, have not said mass on these days, for all their omissions: and that without waiting for them to confess, though some Roman Catholics think that confession is absolutely necessary in order to absolution being valid.

We could understand and approve the ground of this decree, if the Pope had said that though the people are not now required to come to the mass, yet that some, perhaps, might wish to come, and therefore the mass should be said for them. But the Pope does not say this, and it is evident that this is not the reason of the Pope's decree. What the Pope thinks of such importance is, that the priest should say the mass without any one to hear him. Although none should come to the mass, it is "of such great importance" that the mass should be said on those abolished holy days, that the Pope writes to all the bishops in the world (who acknowledge his authority) to tell them so.

At first sight some of our readers may be inclined to think that the Pope has overrated the importance of the omission to say mass on those days.

On carefully considering the matter, we are satisfied that the Pope has not overrated the importance of the omission. On the contrary, we think that nothing in the whole system of salvation, as taught by the Church of Rome, is of more practical importance than the subject on which the Pope has written this letter. We are, therefore, not surprised that the Pope should treat it as "of such importance."

The practical import is this:—It is of vast importance that the mass should be said, on account of the gifts and benefits which the offering of the sacrifice obtains for the faithful; but it is not of any importance that the faithful should attend at the mass; the gifts and graces are obtained for the people by the offering, although none of the faithful be present at it.

It is this that is of such vast importance to the Church of Rome to establish. The people may be employed about this world's business, thinking only of gain and profit, and not troubling themselves about what the priest is doing (for there is no direction in this Encyclical letter

that the people are even to remember that mass is said on those days), and yet the priest, by saying his mass, and offering his sacrifice, may obtain for the people "great spiritual advantages," without any trouble to them.

We believe that the Pope could not be engaged in establishing anything of greater general importance to the system of which he is the head, than in creating and enforcing a system of sacrifice on certain days, about which people need give themselves no trouble, and from which they may yet expect "great spiritual advantages." It is just such a religion as the majority of mankind most desire. Most men would be glad to have their souls saved without any trouble to themselves. A system which appears constructed to accomplish this, will generally be easily admitted by worldly men, without much inquiry into its truth, because they wish it to be true.

The Pope who writes this circular is wise in his generation; he is carrying out the system of his Church, and doing it in the most effectual way, by appealing to the natural desires of sinful and worldly men. He has not overrated the importance of his subject.

There is but one objection to be made—that such religious service does but encourage men to harden their own hearts, and go on in carelessness and security, trusting that their souls can be saved by the priest behind their backs—a very good doctrine for priests in this world, but an awful delusion for souls in the next.

We have never said that the Church of Rome has no other teaching than this, for those who require other teaching. For the earnest and ardent the Church of Rome has exaggeration of feeling and useless self-infliction; for the self-righteous, the Church of Rome has what they wish for; but the mass of men desire to be freed from taking any trouble about the salvation of their souls, and the Pope's Encyclical letter is an important step in developing a system which suits the desires of such persons.

Correspondence.

THE FATHERS v. THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN. TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

RESPECTED SIR,—I must refrain from citing further testimony for the spiritual supremacy of the see of Rome, inasmuch as what has been cited is, by you, either unreplicated to, or, what is worse (for your publication), it tempts you to burthen your pages with tedious and prosy argumentation ending in nothing, except you will have letting the reader know what you think to be something.

I.—Perhaps you have no regard for antiquity, and think that silent contempt is the best thing to meet it; and, with your great apostle, "Care not for a thousand Cyprians and Augustins." Does the CATHOLIC LAYMAN really believe its own hint* that "the Church in the days of the Fathers" is one thing, and "the Church in the days of THEIR Fathers, the Apostles," quite another thing? Now, though the open avowal of this might be rash, would it not be, at least, manly and straightforward?

Perhaps, too, such a confession might be rather premature. For true, though it be, that those ancients are inconveniently Popish, and that not a sentence—not a word can be squeezed out of them favourable to "the spirit of independence," or against submission to pastors, yet may we not entertain readers with all that they do not say about the Pope and the Immaculate Conception? May we not, before casting them overboard, see what can be done by nibbling from them a bit here and a bit there, and then, throwing said nibblings into Popery's face, ask, "Who'll be Popish after that?"

If such is to be, as it has been, the LAYMAN's plan of controversy, and the artifice by which it hopes to make converts, I am a bad subject for its practice.

II.—But if you truly believe the Fathers to be your friends, why not prove it by citing antiquity against antiquity? For the last four months (thanks to the uncommon veracity of the printer of the LAYMAN) the writs of near forty ancients stand^b filed against your system, the least of whom is enough to give it a serious, if not a deadly wound. To meet this long array, you offer or oppose nothing but page after page of your own surmising. No coeval witness is brought against them

^a No. 75, p. 27.

^b No. 74, p. 21, and 75, p. 34.

^a We do not mean here to affirm, as the Pope does, that the cross was the altar on which Christ offered sacrifice. The Jewish sacrifices were types of Christ's. The victim was not killed on the altar, nor was the death of the victim "the offering." In that Jewish sacrifice which was especially the type of Christ, viz., on the great day of atonement, the victim was slain outside, and the offering and atonement was made on the golden altar within the Tabernacle. The Pope does not appear to us either infallible or correct in calling the cross the altar.

^b The Pope had said just above that Christ offered sacrifice "by the effusion of His precious blood." Clearly, then, the sacrifice consisted in the effusion of blood. That a "bloodless sacrifice" can be the same, "except in the manner of offering it," with a sacrifice which consists in the effusion of blood, is a plain contradiction. Can any of our Roman Catholic readers reconcile it?